this responsible position. The vice-presidents are Mrs. Louis Glaser, Mrs. Meyer Swope, and Mrs. A. Loth; the treasurer, Mrs. Elias Michael; recording secretary, Mrs. Louis Bry; corresponding secretary, Miss Sheba Harris; guides, Mrs. Herman Herzog, Mrs. M. Weider, Mrs. Esther Getz, and Mrs. J. Wolfort.

AURELIA STIX RICE.

Sketch Club of St. Louis.—See "Art Development in St. Louis," and "Architectural Club, St. Louis."

Slavery and Emancipation in St. Louis.—It has been impossible to ascertain from any records to which the writer has had access the date of the first importation of African slaves into the settlement which afterward became the city of St. Louis. It is, perhaps, an historical fact of no great importance; it would serve merely to indicate with accuracy the duration of the slave system in this city. It would not mark the beginning of any social or political movement, as slavery had existed in the Province of Louisiana for generations before, and, at the time of Chouteau's expedition in 1764, slaves were held in Ste. Genevieve, Cahokia, and all the older French settlements in the Mississippi Valley. It is not probable that the original band of thirty pioneers brought slaves with them. In reading over their names, we find that they were millers, carpenters, farmers, gunsmiths, traders, and blacksmiths. Men of these avocations could hardly have been slave-owners. They came, as all early settlers come into a new country, to fell the trees and to clear and cultivate the land, to build houses and stockades, and to set about supplying the little community with the necessities of life. They arrived at the site of the future city March 14th; Laclede moved over with his family from Cahokia in the following September, and it is more than probable that he owned slaves and brought them with him to his new home. In the following year there was a great exodus of the French from the territory east of the Mississippi westward across the river, on account of the recent cession to England. A sort of panic seems to have seized the settlers at the thought of falling under English domination, and from all the surrounding posts and villages whole families fled with all their goods and chattels to St. Louis that they might be safe on French soil before the arrival of the British troops. In the same year several families came up the river from New Orleans. It is idle to speculate about probabilities in historical matters, yet, from the fact that these new-comers were from slave-holding towns and that they were possessed of sufficient fortune to enable them to transport their whole establishments to a distant point, it is but reasonable to believe that some among them owned slaves and carried them to St. Louis. If this be correct, then slavery was established here as a feature of life in the village not later than 1765. On December 17, 1766, an inventory was filed in the archives of St. Louis of the property of Daniel Blouin, which he had agreed to sell to John Datchurut, and it included "a negro man named Caesar, and his wife, Jeanetton; four negro men, Marthurin, Batiste, Noyos and Jasmin." Mr. Billon mentions that the deed was executed in St. Louis, January 17, 1767. There is also on record an agreement entered into before the royal notary of the Illinois on August 14, 1768, whereby "Alexander Langlais, a traveling trader, living at the post of St. Louis, by these presents, voluntarily binds himself to Mr. Antoine Hubert, merchant, residing at the post of St. Louis," to go to the post of the Little Osages and there trade with the Indians as the clerk of Mr. Hubert. The instrument continues: "This agreement is made for the sum of eight hundred livres in peltries, deer-skins, or beaver, at the current price of the same at this post, which they will establish on the peltries of this trade on his arrival at St. Louis. It is also agreed that in case said Langlais will take a negro in place of the said sum of eight hundred livres in peltries, said Mr. Hubert obligates himself to deliver him one on the arrival of the convoy from New Orleans in the next spring, said negro to be sound and free from all disease, in which case the said Langlais will repay to Mr. Hubert said amount of eight hundred livres in the same manner in peltries." (Billon, Vol. 1, p. 62.) It is evident from this that the sale and barter of slaves was begun in St. Louis within two years after the city had been founded.

At this time the famous Black Code of Louisiana, which had been proclaimed in 1724, was in force throughout the Province. It consisted of fifty-four articles and contained the most minute and specific provisions for the control and management, not only of the slaves but even of the free negroes, while it also de-

fined and limited the powers of the masters. It is too lengthy to insert in full, but reference to a few sections is sufficient to show the conditions which it was designed to meet. If a master, for instance, allowed his slave to work on Sunday, the negro was confiscated. Negro children followed the condition of their mothers. If she was free they were born free, even though the father might be a slave; if she were a slave the children became the property of her owners. Slaves could not be witnesses in either a civil or criminal action, except when there was a default of competent white witnesses, and in no event could they be witnesses either for or against their masters. They could not be parties to a civil suit nor complainants in criminal causes. If a slave struck his master, or any member of his family with sufficient force to cause a bruise or to draw blood, he was liable to capital punishment, as he was also for any other "outrages or acts of violence" committed against free white persons. Stealing of horses or cattle, "according to the circumstances of the case," was a capital offense. A runaway slave who did not surrender himself within one month after having been denounced to the authorities, "shall have his ears cut off and shall be branded with the flower de luce on his shoulder. For the second offense within that time he shall be hamstrung and branded on the other shoulder, and for a third offense he shall be executed." When a slave was sentenced to death for a crime in which his master did not participate, he was to be appraised by two persons whom the judge appointed and the value of the slave was to be paid to the owner; to raise this sum "a proportional tax shall be laid on each slave." The only punishments which masters could inflict on their slaves were to have them whipped, but only with rods or ropes, and to put them in irons. If they racked or mutilated them the slaves so treated might be confiscated. In almost every case where confiscation is provided for it is prescribed that the slave be sold at public auction, and the proceeds handed over to the nearest hospital. Husband and wife were not to be sold separately, when owned by the same master, and children under fourteen were not to be separated from their parents. A slave owner over twenty five years of age could manumit his slaves on obtaining a decree of permission from the superior council, but to do this he had to satisfy the council that he had good and sufficient reasons for wishing to free his slaves. All negroes, whether free-born or manumitted slaves, were incapable of receiving donations, either by testamentary disposition, or by gifts, "*inter vivos*," from the whites. The code contains also a mass of details, which it is not necessary to recite here.

In those early days which we are now considering the western part of the American continent was almost a "*terra incognita*," even to the European governments which claimed possessions therein. It was then a vast wilderness where a few small settlements were to be found separated from each other by great distances of a trackless country infested by hostile Indians. The southern part of the Province was, of course, more quickly populated, and the towns were in comparatively easy communication with each other. But in Upper Louisiana the conditions were quite different. Once a year the river settlements received consignments from New Orleans. It took months to complete the journey northward from the capital to the villages in the Province of Illinois. So remote were the settlements that in several cases considerable time elapsed before even civil authority was established in them. It is not surprising, therefore, that neither France nor Spain attempted to perform what may be called the less necessary functions of government, such as the taking of a census, or the procuring of other accurate information concerning the state of the population. The cessions of Louisiana from one power to another and the political changes in Europe also tended to bring about this result. For these reasons the facts and statistics contained in such official records as are within reach of an inquirer in St. Louis are of the most unsatisfactory character for a research such as the present. The best information that can be obtained must be gathered from unofficial data, such as recorded wills, deeds and inventories; but these, while interesting enough in themselves as evidence of particular transactions, do not supply sufficient material to enable us to form a comprehensive idea of the part that slavery had in the early history of our city. It is practically an impossibility to ascertain the number of slaves held here at any given time during the colonial period, the numbers of whites, free colored and slaves, and the varying proportion which these classes bore to each other from year to year. It is true that, in 1769, General Alexander O'Reilly,

soon after taking possession of the Province as Spanish Governor-General, ordered a census to be taken of New Orleans, and there is reason to believe that this was done with great accuracy. The population of the rest of the colony, however, was estimated on figures that can not be verified, and which were probably founded on reports from traders and other travelers. The entire population of the Province in that year was 13,538, but of this total 7,382 is credited to New Orleans and Tchoupitoulas alone. St. Louis was supposed to have 891 inhabitants, and about half of the population of the entire colony was white. When no more accurate or complete information than this is obtainable it will be seen how difficult it is to present a satisfactory statement of the history of slavery in St. Louis in its early years.

An incident occurred in St. Louis in 1779 which enables us to form some idea as to the sort of treatment accorded to disorderly slaves, and also as to the responsibilities to which their owners were subject. On the 21st of January a negro slave woman named Lorine attacked Marianne, a mulatto slave woman, in the course of a dispute concerning the right to use a hole which had been cut in the ice on Mill Creek, where both were engaged in washing. Lorine threw Marianne into the water, and would have drowned her, but that another slave woman dragged her out; and then Lorine, after having beaten her severely, threw her into a fire, which was burning near by. The law acted promptly, and the offense met with a swift punishment; the trial was had the next morning before Captain De Volsay, the post adjutant, as Governor De Leyba, being the owner of Marianne, had placed the matter in his hands. The court sentenced Lorine to receive one hundred lashes in public; fifty on the same day at four o'clock, and the balance on the next day at the same hour. It was "ordered, furthermore, that Mr. Roubien and wife, owners of said slave, Lorine, be held responsible for the appearance in case of the death of Marianne, and until her perfect recovery, and that they pay the surgeon's bill for attendance until her complete recovery, and all costs and charges of this prosecution." (Billon, Vol. I, p. 58.) The ownership of slaves, it will be seen exposed the master to liabilities which might be extremely serious in their results. The whole subject of the duties and rights of slaves—for they had rights which were recognized by law—the punishments which might be inflicted on them, and the obligations of slave owners is covered by a decree of Baron de Carondelet which he promulgated in 1795, being, at that time, Governor-General of Louisiana, and which modified, to some extent, the more severe restrictions of the Black Code. It discloses a condition of society, which, to many of us, appears unintelligible, yet Major Amos Stoddard, who abhorred slavery and every feature of it, cites this decree in his "Sketches of Louisiana," as an example of philanthropic endeavor on the part of Carondelet to ameliorate the condition of the slaves. It is interesting to note the fear of a slave insurrection, which is apparent, and which is so carefully provided against in various articles. Major Stoddard's version of this decree is as follows: "In 1795 he published an ordinance on the subject, by which he established the monthly allowance of corn in the ear to each slave at one barrel. It was recommended to masters to assign waste lands to their slaves for the purpose of enabling them to raise the necessaries of life; and if this allowance was denied them, they were obliged to furnish each of them with a linen shirt and trousers for summer, and a woolen great coat and trousers for winter. Labor was to commence at the break of day, and to cease at the approach of night. Half an hour was allowed for breakfast, and two hours for dinner. Slaves were allowed on Sundays to rest or to work for themselves, except in time of harvest, when their masters were authorized to employ them, paying them about thirty cents each per diem. Punishments at one time, under a penalty of fifty dollars, were not to exceed thirty lashes; but the stripes were allowed to be repeated after the interval of a day. It was permitted to fire on negroes who had deserted their masters; also on those unarmed, if they refused to submit, when required, or presumed to defend themselves against their masters or overseers, and likewise those who entered a plantation with an intent to steal. Those who killed or wounded a negro, except in the above cases, were threatened with the severest penalties of the law. The amusements among slaves were restricted to Sundays, and the planters were forbidden, under a penalty of ten dollars, to suffer any strange negroes to visit their plantations after dark; and they were also forbidden, under a like penalty, to permit any intrigues or plots of escape to be formed on

their plantations by negroes belonging to others. No slave was permitted to leave the plantation of his master without a written permission, under a penalty of twenty lashes; and if any slave was found riding the horse of his master without the like permission, he was liable to receive thirty lashes. Firearms, powder and lead, found in the possession of slaves, were liable to confiscation; and such slaves were adjudged to receive thirty lashes. No planter was allowed to employ more than two slaves to hunt for him at the same time; and on their return from the chase they were obliged to deliver up their arms. No slave was allowed to sell anything, not even the productions of his own labor, without the permission of his master."

The purchase of Louisiana by Jefferson in 1803 did not, of course, affect the right to hold slaves, as slavery was at that time a legalized institution in the United States. In the subsequent year, when the formal cession took place at St. Louis, the population of this city was 1,080, while the total free population of the district of St. Louis, which comprised all the region between the Meramec and Missouri Rivers, was 2,280, and the number of slaves was estimated at 500. In 1810, six years later, the slaves in St. Louis were reckoned between a fourth and a fifth of the population. The occupations in which they were employed were very similar to those in which their descendants are usually to be found at this day. A large number of them were household servants, and as the town grew in size and wealth, and a more luxurious style of living became possible, great numbers of slaves were to be found in the private houses of the more prosperous citizens. Every man of means had his body-servant, or valet, as he would now be called, and his wife and daughters were attended by their negro maids. Not infrequently a slave would be deeded to an infant for this purpose. The cooks, of course, were slaves, generally women; the Creoles were always fond of a good and generous table, and in "darky cooking," improved, perhaps, by recipes brought from France, they found entire satisfaction, while the numerous dishes, which are favorites throughout the South to this day, are evidences of the gastronomic talents of the old slave cooks, who first invented them. The keys of the store room were usually committed to the care of some trusted female slave, and she became the custodian of that precious store of household luxuries, the supplies brought with much trouble and expense from New Orleans, and on her fell the responsibility of making the stock on hand last through the year, until the barges again came up the river in the following spring. Several of the larger places had private smokehouses, where the ham and bacon for family use were prepared. The mistress of the house took charge of the still room, an important department, where home-made wines, preserves and other delicacies, and sometimes medicines, were produced. The work was done by slaves who were especially trained for the purpose. This sort of education often began when the slave was a mere child, and it added considerably to his or her value in the market. The cooks, for instance, had with them in the kitchen, as assistants or scullery-maids, one or more young girls, to whom they imparted the secrets of their art, and who in time became skilled cooks themselves. The laundresses were also slave women, and on certain days of the week the banks of the stream which is now confined in the Mill Creek sewer were crowded with the women washing the clothes in the running water, or beating them on flat rocks with wooden paddles, while the turf and bushes about were covered with the linen spread out to bleach. With few, if any, exceptions, all the household servants in St. Louis for years were slaves. They were, of course, employed in other occupations; they were literally the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the community. Slave labor was used on the farms and kitchen gardens surrounding the city, and much of the heavy work of all kinds was done by them. With the development of steamboat traffic a new use was found for them, both in the carrying trade and along the river front.

There is a memorandum in existence containing a record of the sale of all slaves belonging to the estate of Auguste Chouteau, and the results are probably a fair indication of the price of slaves at that time. The sale took place September 15, 1830. This paper gives the names of the purchasers, the names and ages of the slaves, and the price paid for each. Of the thirty-seven slaves only one was not disposed of, and that was one Pitre, Chouteau's old body-servant; the reason for this exception becomes apparent when we find his age listed at one hundred and two years. The next in age was seventy-four, while there are

others mentioned merely as infants, and sold with their mothers. The total proceeds of the sale were $10,869, giving an average price of almost $302 per slave. The highest price was paid by Hippolite Papin, who bought Joseph Clarice, aged eighteen, for $605, and Grand Louis, aged seventy-four, was knocked down to Henry Chouteau for $50, which was the cheapest purchase made. It may be noted that most of these slaves were bought by the immediate family and friends of Auguste Chouteau.

In the course of time, as St. Louis became the metropolis of the Mississippi Valley, it also naturally became the slave market for the surrounding country. Just as in the earlier days the merchant or trader went to New Orleans and bought his slaves there, so the farmer or planter, from either up or down the river, or from the "back country," would come to St. Louis, both to buy and sell his slaves. There were always a number of slaves on sale, from which he could make his choice; and if he wanted to dispose of his human properties the chances were always in favor of his obtaining better prices in the city. As a natural consequence of this condition of affairs, there sprang up a class of slave dealers, or "nigger-traders," as they were then known, who made a business of buying and selling slaves like merchandise. Slaves were sometimes good investments, and several of these dealers acquired considerable fortunes by their speculations in this class of property. They were sometimes the auctioneers when slaves were sold at public vendue, and as an incident to their trade, they established slave-pens, where their stock on hand could be maintained until disposed of, and where they could be examined by prospective purchasers, like horses in a paddock. These slave-pens were at different points in the older portions of the city, and, perhaps, the best known was on what is now South Broadway, on the corner of Clark Avenue, and by one of the strange turns of events it was used during the Civil War as a Federal prison.

A word should, perhaps, be said concerning the treatment of the slaves by their masters. There seems to be no reason to doubt that, as a rule, the slaves in St. Louis were well cared for. Public opinion was in favor of it. While there were bad masters, it must not be forgotten that there were also bad slaves. The cases of cruelty and oppression were sure to become matters of public gossip, while, on the other hand, the master who treated his slaves with humanity, attracted no attention, because he did what was expected of him. The majority of the slaves were well housed, well fed and well clothed. In time of sickness medical attendance was provided for them, and the master and members of his family made it their business to see that proper attention was given to the sick among their slaves. The great terror of the slave's life was that he might be sent South. To be "sold down the river" was the most awful fate that could befall him. This shows, at least, that the slaves could imagine worse treatment than they received here. But perhaps the best evidence is the devotion and real affection which in so many cases the emancipated slaves showed to their old masters. They are a class which is becoming extinct, but every slave-holding family in the city knows of cases where their ex-slaves have maintained a loyal attachment to the persons who once owned them. Even at this day a few remain who follow the fortunes of "my old white people" with unselfish interest; every birth, or death, or marriage in the family brings them to the house to share, with an humble but sympathetic participation, in the joys or sorrows of their former masters. Of course, there were slaves who attempted to escape. Generations of slaves' ancestors could not crush out the instinctive desire for freedom in the race. In looking over the files of old newspapers one finds in almost every issue advertisements of rewards for the capture of escaped slaves, with little pictures, all exactly alike, of the black man running, in great haste, with his stick and bundle over his shoulder, and of the woman, a bandanna tied about her head, who is apparently not as speedy in her flight—representations as conventional as the cuts of steamboats, which still adorn the advertising columns of our newspapers. One gathers the impression from these notices that, to use the language in which they are couched, "my mulatto boy, Tom," and "my black wench, Lucy," must have given their owners considerable annoyance by their constant efforts to escape. But it is not fair to say that the slave was always fleeing from cruel treatment. The unavoidable and essential features of the slave system itself, the possible separation of husband from wife, or of parents from children, the public whipping post, the never ending restraint, and all the other circumstances which must, of necessity, attend the institution of

slavery, as shown by the slave laws of the period, are, in themselves, a sufficient explanation of the reason that so many slaves took a desperate chance to reach a strange land where they might find themselves penniless, homeless and friendless, but free.

There was no agitation looking to the emancipation of the slaves during the French and Spanish periods of our history. In the tranquil and conservative atmosphere of the French settlement, existing conditions were not questioned, and were accepted by one generation after another without change. General Collot, in describing Upper Louisiana, in 1796, says that the reply of the Creoles to any suggested innovation is always: "It is the custom; so it was with our fathers. I get along with it; so, of course, will my children." Slavery was in the established order of things, and therefore there was no slavery question in French St. Louis. After the Louisiana purchase, however, and particularly after the admission of Missouri to the Union, the echoes of the abolition movement reached the western banks of the Mississippi River. The State of Missouri itself entered the Union in the midst of a storm of partisan and sectional conflict at Washington, which was to lead the nation with an awful certainty into further dissension and unrest until it reached the climax of a civil war. But slavery was still to be permitted in Missouri, the State. The Missouri compromise, although afterward declared by the Supreme Court to be worthless, as binding on subsequent legislation, gave both parties an opportunity to permit the admission of Missouri, without sacrificing their fundamental principles. Statehood was conferred on Maine at the same time, for, as Canning had called upon the New World to redress the balance of the Old, so the statesmen of that day called upon the free-soil North to preserve the country from control by the slave-holding States of the South. The most interesting feature of the history of slavery in this city is undoubtedly the political struggle which was urged on this issue, for and against, but as a discussion of this subject would involve a repetition of the political history of the State at large, and even of the nation from 1820 to 1865, and more particularly as it would trespass on the papers of those to whom such topics as the war and the secession and abolition movements have been assigned, it is not practicable to enter here into a review of those matters. There is one important incident, however, which it may be permissible to mention, as showing that the slavery question in Missouri might have met with an easy solution if the foresight and wisdom of her political leaders had not been rendered nugatory by an accident, which could neither have been foreseen nor prevented. In Switzer's "History of Missouri" there is an account of a secret meeting held in St. Louis in 1827 or 1828, which was attended by the leaders of both parties representing all sections of the State. There were about twenty or thirty in the gathering which came together for the purpose of devising means to rid the State of slavery. Barton and Blair attended; and the result of their deliberations was the following plan of action: They agreed to bring, if possible, all the candidates at the coming election into the movement. On the same day, all over the State, resolutions, secretly prepared and printed, were to be publicly circulated in the form of anti-slavery memorials, and the machinery of both parties was pledged to procuring the signatures of the electors. The meeting was harmonious, and the delegates separated in the belief that their plan would be successful. Everything was in readiness when suddenly a story, emanating from an unknown source, went flying from mouth to mouth throughout the State to the effect that Alexander Tappan had entertained negroes at dinner, and that his daughters had been seen driving with them in his carriage. "Perhaps it was not true, but it was believed in Missouri, and raised such a furore that we dare not and did not let our memorials see the light." The opportunity was lost forever, and slavery was thereafter to be considered only as a partisan question. It was but a few years later, in 1836, that a mob, on the night of the 21st of July, attacked the office of the St. Louis "Observer," an abolition newspaper, published by the Rev. Elijah P. Lovejoy. The presses and other contents of the building were wrecked and destroyed, and public feeling was so aroused that Lovejoy moved to Alton, where he was killed the following November, in attempting to defend his property against a similar attack.

In 1854 a lawsuit was instituted in St. Louis, which, in its ultimate results, was destined to have the most far-reaching effects on the public events of the future. At the April term of that year in the United States circuit court for the District of Missouri, Dred Scott, a negro,

brought an action against John F. A. Sandford, the immediate purpose of which was to establish his freedom, and that of his wife and two daughters, whom Sandford claimed as his slaves. It was a case of trespass *vi et armis*, on the ground that Sandford had illegally taken them into custody. The case had been previously tried in the circuit court of St. Louis County, a State court, in which Scott had been successful, but on Sandford's appeal to the State Supreme Court that cause had been reversed and remanded to the circuit court, where it was pending when Scott brought suit in the Federal court. The judgment there was against him, and he appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. An extraordinary number of issues was raised, including the right of Scott to litigate, questions of citizenship and jurisdiction, the status of slaves and of free colored persons, the legal aspect of the slavery question, and several important interpretations of the Constitution. Chief Justice Taney delivered one of the most weighty and exhaustive opinions that has ever been handed down from the Supreme Court. It is not necessary to discuss the case further. It was held that Scott had no standing in court as a litigant, and that he could not claim emancipation from the fact that his master had, at one time, removed him to a free State. His condition of slavery was confirmed, and as the case had aroused the interest of the entire country when slavery was a burning issue and a great political question, the decision of the court did much to aggravate the "irrepressible conflict." The Dred Scott case is one of those famous in American reports, and it has given rise to one of the most persistent misquotations of its language, for it will probably always be said, as it was said then, and as it is frequently said to-day, that the court was of the opinion that "the negro has no rights which the white man is bound to respect."

The Missouri Statutes of 1855 recognized the usual division of the African population of the State into two classes, the free negroes and mulattoes and the slaves. The laws in regard to free colored persons were very severe. No negro or mulatto could own firearms or ammunition, or any sort of weapon without a license from a justice of the peace. The county courts were required to have brought before them all free negroes and mulattoes in the county between the ages of seven and twenty-one years, and to bind them out to be apprentices or servants; "but no colored apprentice shall be placed in company with a free white apprentice." No colored person could live in this State without a license, and these licenses were to be issued only to certain classes of them; moreover, bond, not exceeding a thousand dollars, had to be given in security for good behavior. The negro was not allowed to retain in his possession the license or other free papers, though he could obtain them in the event of his moving from one county to another, as they had to be filed with the clerk of the county court where he resided. No free negro or mulatto could emigrate into the State, or enter the State, unless in the service of a white man, or for the purpose of passing through. In either case the time that he could remain in the borders was limited. If he stayed longer he was liable to arrest, a fine of ten dollars, and expulsion. If the fine was not paid he was further liable to not more than twenty lashes, and the court could either order that he immediately leave the State or else hire him out until the fine, costs and expenses of imprisonment had been paid for by his labor. Any person keeping or teaching a school for the instruction of negroes and mulattoes in reading or writing was liable to a fine, not in excess of five hundred dollars and imprisonment not exceeding six months. No meeting or assemblage for the purpose of religious worship or preaching was permitted, where the services were performed by some of their own race, unless a sheriff, constable, marshal, public officer or justice of the peace was present. All meetings of negroes or mulattoes for the purpose of learning or religion, were declared unlawful assemblages, and it was made the duty of the public officers to suppress them. The slave laws of the same date recall in many instances the Black Code and the ordinance of Carondelet. A master who hired his slave to another slave, or who allowed his slave "to go at large upon the hiring of his own time, or to act or do as a free person, or to hire himself, within this State," was to be fined between twenty and one hundred dollars for each offense, and the slave was to be held in jail until his owner gave bond that the offense would not be repeated. A slave going from the tenement of his master without written permission, or entering upon a plantation without the written consent of the owner or overseer, unless he was sent by his master on lawful business, was punished by flogging. "Insolent and in-

sulting language of slaves to white people shall be punished with stripes at the discretion of a justice of the peace," was another provision of the code. No one could allow more than five slaves belonging to others on his property at the same time, and these could not remain more than four hours without the written consent of their owners. Ferrymen or other persons who carried a slave across the Mississippi without a written pass from his owner was liable to the owner for the value of the slave, costs and damages, and the boat used for the purpose, or even for bringing the slave from one point to another in the State, might be libeled. Most offenses committed by the slaves were punished by stripes.

A comparison of the following figures, giving the census of St. Louis in 1850 and in 1860, is interesting, as showing the decrease in the number of slaves, while the free population was steadily growing:

	1850.	1860.
Whites	73,806	157,476
Free colored	1,358	1,755
Slaves	2,656	1,542
Total	77,850	160,773

It only remains to record the death of slavery in St. Louis, and for this purpose it is necessary to look for a moment into the history of the State. On January 6, 1865, a Constitutional Convention of sixty-six delegates met in the Mercantile Library Hall, in St. Louis, to frame a new State Constitution, which was to be submitted to the electors at the next election. The first committee appointed was named for the purpose of drawing up an article of emancipation, and on January 11th they reported the following ordinance: "An ordinance abolishing slavery in Missouri: Be it ordained by the people of the State of Missouri, in convention assembled: That hereafter in this State there shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except in punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted; and all persons held to service or labor as slaves are hereby declared free." A number of amendments were moved, most of them providing for a gradual emancipation, or for recompensing the slave-owners, but the ordinance was finally carried in its original form by a vote of sixty yeas, four nays, and two absent. The new Constitution went into effect July 4, 1865. Emancipation had been practically achieved before that date. After Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamations of September, 1862, and January, 1863, it was evident that freedom for the slaves throughout the country was an assured fact. In this manner slavery in St. Louis came to an end after an existence of over a century. Henceforth the slaves were free, and had to work out their own salvation. Amendments to the Federal Constitution placed the matter beyond the possibility of doubt; the "peculiar institution" ceased to exist; the slavery question was dead, and the problem which had vexed the nation for so many years was settled forever.

JULIUS L. FOY.

Sloss, James L., merchant, was born in Florence, Alabama, August 4, 1833, and died in St. Louis August 17, 1882. His father, who came of Scotch-Irish antecedents, was a Presbyterian clergyman, who was engaged for many years in ministerial work in the State of Alabama. His mother was a daughter of Judge David Campbell, a native of Virginia, whose ancestors emigrated from the Highlands of Scotland to Ireland during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. From Ireland representatives of the family came to America, and settled first in Pennsylvania, in 1726. From there they removed to Orange County, Virginia, in 1730. Judge Campbell, who came of this Virginia family, was appointed first Federal judge of the Territory of Tennessee, which he had aided to separate from the State of North Carolina. He was of the same family as Colonel William Campbell, the hero of the battle of King's Mountain, of whom Lafayette said that his services in that battle would "do his memory everlasting honor and insure him a high rank among the defenders of liberty in the American cause." Reared in the most prosperous and progressive portion of the State of Alabama, James L. Sloss received careful educational training in early youth, and at fifteen years of age was well fitted to begin preparations for a business career. At that age he became a clerk in a store in Tuscumbia, Alabama, and at the end of a year's experience in that place returned to his native town of Florence, where he was employed for six years thereafter as clerk and salesman in a commercial establishment. Having by this time attained his majority, he became ambitious to enter a more promising field of enterprise than was afforded by the quiet Southern town of Florence, and, with this object in view, he went to Kansas. The fierce warfare between the